DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 526 CG 008 450

TITLE	The Challenge of Youth Service Bureaus.
INSTITUTION	Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	DHEW-SRS-73-26024
PUB DATE	73
NOTE	46p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (#1766-00012 , $0.50)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Programs; Crime; Delinquency; *Delinquency Prevention; *Delinquent Rehabilitation; Juvenile Courts; Social Services; Surveys; *Youth Problems; *Youth Programs

ABSTRACT

This publication is the report of a study of the nationwide youth services bureau effort undertaken by the youth authority of California at the request of the Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration in 1971. Questionnaires (dealing with types of program, organization, program administration, funding, staff, clients, and primary objectives) were returned from 222 of the 262 agencies contacted. Surveys findings conclude that, although bureaus are widespread, their conceptual bases and funding levels have not been sufficient in scope to make much difference in the way that our society deals with troubled youth. However, there is evidence that youth services bureaus have pioneered programs that are changing ways in which their own communities provide such services, which is encouraging for the future of the bureau concept. The report suggests these principles for the implementation of a youth service bureau: (1) organization and program must remain flexible in order to respond to a community's unique needs and unanticipated problems; (2) programs must deal with the community power structure, including those believing in a punitive and deterrant course of action; (3) programs must be real substitutes for other courses of action; (4) programs must use the favorable public bias toward children to its fullest advantage; and (5) programs must provide for evaluation and research. The report also points out that staff is the single most important ingredient of the youth service bureau. (Author/EAK)

ED 083526

THE CHALLENGE OF YOUTH SERVICE BUREAUS

CG 008 450

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 083526

THE CHALLENGE OF YOUTH SERVICE BUREAUS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Social and Rehabilitation Service
Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration
Washington, D.C.
1973
DHEW Publication No. (SRS)73-26024

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402. Price: 50 cents, domestic postpaid; 35 cents, GPO Bookstore
Stock Number 1766-00012

Foreword

One of the major recommendations of the 1967 Report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice stated:

> "Communities should establish neighborhood youth-serving agencies—Youth Service Bureaus—located if possible in comprehensive neighborhood community centers and receiving juveniles (delinquent and nondelinquent) referred by the police, the juvenile court, parents, schools, and other sources.
>
> "The agencies would act as central coordinators of all community services for young people and would also provide services lacking in the community or neighborhood, especially ones designed for less seriously delinquent juveniles."

Since then, many youth services bureaus have been started throughout the Nation. But because the report did not explicitly detail the organization and purposes of the bureaus, they have apparently grown haphazardly and one community's bureau may bear little or no resemblance to another community's bureau.

Recognizing this diversity and—perhaps—confusion, in 1971 the Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration asked the youth authority of California to undertake a national study of the nationwide youth services bureau effort. This publication is the report of that national study.

An important finding of the study concludes that, although the bureaus are widespread, their conceptual bases and funding levels have not been of sufficient scope to really make a difference in the way that American society deals with delinquent and troubled youth.

However, there is also ample evidence that youth services bureaus have pioneered programs which are changing ways in which their own communities provide services to youth. This, according to the study, is encouraging and could offer better hope for the future if the bureau concept were to become an integral part of Federal, State and local policy.

While the findings of the study are far from conclusive, no better study from a purely scientific view exists. The YDDPA is making this study available in order to provide important information to delinquency planners and policy makers, and to all who work to help the Nation's youngsters.

Robert J. Gemignani
Commissioner
Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration

Contents

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. RATIONALE FOR YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU 4

III. METHODOLOGY 11

IV. GENERAL FINDINGS 18

V. PROGRAM EXAMPLES 27

VI. SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS 45

Footnotes 53

Bibliography 55

Survey Respondents 67

I. Introduction

> *This report, (The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society) has shown that most criminal careers begin in youth, and that, therefore, programs that will reduce juvenile delinquency and keep delinquent and youthful offenders from settling into lives of crime are indispensable parts of a national strategy. It has shown that the formal criminal process, arrest-to-trial-to-punishment, seldom protects the community from offenders of certain kinds and, therefore, the criminal justice system and the community must jointly seek alternative ways of treating them.*[1]
>
> *The Youth Service Bureau—an agency to handle many troubled, troublesome young people outside of the criminal justice system—is needed in part because society has failed to give the juvenile court the resources that would allow it to function as its founders hoped it would.*[2]

The Crime Commission's recommendation for youth service bureaus set forth general purpose but was not specific in regard to operation or definition. References to youth service bureaus in the original Commission report have been called both too general and too limiting, and interpretations as to the purpose and organizational structure of youth service bureaus continue to be a matter of debate.

In the original Commission report it is difficult to determine whether the youth service bureau was meant to be independent or a part of some larger agency, or both. In some references, the Commission report urged the establishment of a single agency with a broad range of services. Yet, in other sections of the report it is implied that such an agency should be located in a comprehensive community center and be a part of some other agency. This report is also ambiguous in the sense that it defines permissive programs for nondelinquents, as well as emphasizing programs that must be offered to delinquent youth within what appears to be a modified justice agency structure, i.e., which in fact shares an agency responsibility for some of the jurisdiction and services traditionally offered by the juvenile court.

There is also a subtleness about the text of the Commission report that creates problems. "Thought in the United States has concentrated on creating *alternatives* to adjudication for an increasing number of cases, rather

than on providing substitutes for adjudication." [3] Alternative and substitute, although frequently used as synonyms, are not; the former provides additional choices, while the latter replaces. A very careful reading of all pertinent parts of the Commission text relating to youth service bureaus suggest that youth service bureaus provide needed services to youth *as a substitute* (a replacement) for court services and *not in alternative* (additional choices). This includes delivering services to youth who are in jeopardy of committing public offenses or engaging in conduct which is not considered acceptable in the general community. Emphasis is clearly on a process that does not stigmatize nor involve youth exhibiting problem behavior in the criminal justice system any further than is absolutely necessary.

The Commission report implies that the youth service bureau is something more than just a new service agency providing alternatives to the juvenile court. Some have argued that the Commission's recommendation for youth service bureaus went too far, yet others, not far enough. The bureau concept could have been expanded by providing operational models; it was not! In effect, the President's Crime Commission's reports do not offer a clear definition regarding what a youth service bureau is or should be. The various reports mixed ideas and concepts, while at the same time providing fragments of program prescriptions.

It was for this reason that staff of the National Youth Service Bureau Study elected to consider for possible inclusion in the study any program identified by Governors, stage planning agents, regional staff of national private and governmental organizations as a youth service bureau. Less than 200 survived the initial national census of youth service bureaus conducted by project staff.

II. Rationale for Youth Service Bureau

The recommendation for the establishment of a new community agency to be known as a youth service bureau was an attempt by staff of the President's Crime Commission to come to grips with the failure of the juvenile court to achieve its goals. Diversion from the criminal justice system through a substitute agency, whether planned or stated, was the primary and underlying reason for the advancement of the concept of youth service bureaus.

More and more questions are being asked as to whether the justice system is the most effective method for preventing further delinquency among the bulk of juveniles who get into trouble. Disillusionment with the effect of the juvenile justice system stems from ambiguous definitions of delinquency, dispositions based on idiosyncratic decisions, adverse consequences resulting from the justice system processing, and consistent understaffing of manpower and resources required to carry out the objectives of the juvenile court system.

Because of the ambiguities of the law regarding juvenile behavior and the opportunity for minor law infractions, the massive volume of officially labeled delinquents represents only a fraction of the young people who could be labeled.

> *Given the broad mandate of the juvenile court and the catchall character of the statutes which define delinquency, there are virtually no nondelinquents. Juveniles have committed and commit acts daily which, if detected, could result in adjudication. Consequently, from the standpoint of social control, it is necessary to question the utility of legal norms about which there is such ambiguity.*[4]
>
> *If the system of criminal justice did not operate selectively, we would literally have all been in jail at one time or another and many of us would still be there. This is not because crime is rampant but because opportunities for running afoul of one prohibition or another are so abundant.*[5]

The catchall character of delinquency creates an uneven response to delinquency by the community, the police, and the court—even in defining and reporting of delinquency and in apprehending, detaining, and referring the young person for further processing by the system. Ideally, this processing would be through a system of procedures by which illegal behavior

by juveniles would be handled through stages of decision and action according to some deliberate plan. In reality, the system by which we process children in trouble is faulty.

At each decision point within the juvenile or criminal justice system, there is a selective reduction of young people who penetrate the next step. For example, estimates indicate that during 1970 almost 4 million juveniles had a police contact. Two million of the contacts resulted in arrest, and over 1 million of the arrests resulted in referral to the juvenile court. Of the 1 million national arrests referred to court, only 500,000 resulted in a court appearance.[6] Although some of these cases were closed for lack of evidence, a large part of this reduction in cases is based on the overreferral for service, i.e., many more young people are referred to court by police, parents, schools, and others than can realistically be processed by the juvenile system at the present time.

Discretion throughout the various parts of the justice process permits the police, probation departments, or courts to eliminate many referrals from further processing. The absence of clear-cut criteria for selective reduction from the juvenile justice system processing encourages screening based on idiosyncratic choice. Currently, law enforcement and court personnel are tacitly encouraged ". . . to develop their own policy, for good or evil, and perhaps discover policy by looking backward to determine what has been done." [7]

Studies have reported a variety of bases for decisionmaking at each step of juvenile justice system processing. Decisions are heavily weighted by individual discretion and are often based on factors which may be irrelevant to preserving public safety in the community. For example, one study pointed to the youth's demeanor, style of dress, and ethnic group as factors used in making an arrest decision.[8]

Another study of police-juvenile interaction showed that decisions to arrest juveniles are greatly affected by the presence and preference of a complainant, with arrest more frequent when the complainant is present and when he urges strong action.[9] Thus, police attitudes and the attitudes of the community residents toward youth are significant factors affecting whether they will be processed further by the justice system.

These examples are in part manifestations of the social and economic inequities in the present system of discretion and decisionmaking exercised in response to criminal and delinquent behavior. More specifically:

> *The power of a group determines its ability to keep its people out of trouble with the law even in instances where they have actually violated it. . . . When a group's general capacity to influence is high, the official delinquency rates of its children and youth tend to be low.*[10]

The same writer points out that competent communities have long been reducing official delinquency by meeting the problem through unofficial means, utilizing the community's—*not* an individual's—sustained, organized,

recognized, and utilized power. In this way, community conditions and organizational arrangements significantly contribute to and differentiate who is to be or not to be a delinquent. Other experts have cited individual economic power to buy services for one's child as another method of selective reduction from justice system processing.[11]

The juvenile court has been called ". . . the marketplace wherein the community reputation and social identities of youth in trouble are transacted.[12] For all too many youth it becomes a marketplace wherein a negative community reputation is unwillingly purchased, consumer protection is minimal, and all sales are final.

Once a juvenile is identified as a delinquent, labeling and differential handling allow him few opportunities for positive participation in the normal or more acceptable institutions within his community. There are many examples of how the stigma resulting from a delinquency record can produce multiple handicaps: increased police surveillance, neighborhood isolation, lowered receptivity and tolerance by school officials, and rejection by prospective employers.[13]

Disadvantages arising from the present practice of enmeshing juveniles in the justice system are many. There is excessive referral to the justice system of youth committing acts based on the ambiguous catchall character of current delinquency statutes and the community's attitudes toward defining and responding to delinquency. There is differential selection for further processing determined by idiosyncratic dispositional choices, but on a more profound level, based on the community's political power or the family's economic power. Officially labeling a young person a delinquent, thereby stigmatizing him, only compounds the inequities generated by his initial selection from an amorphous pool of would-be delinquents.

Programs need to focus on problem behavior rather than labeling. For example, the child or youth who suffers from a reading handicap is not permanently or negatively labeled if the reading deficiency is overcome; the ex-student labeled a "dropout" is. Acting-out behavior that is dealt with on a behavioral level, rather than a legal level, avoids the unnecessary noun label of psychotic or delinquent, depending on what type of agency is doing the labeling. Noun labels present society with an easy opportunity to organize their thoughts about the person or the offense on a permanent basis; hence, we have ex-offenders, ex-delinquents, or ex-psychotics. A definition of issues in terms of behavior changes the approach to care, control, or treatment, and limits society's ability to permanently label behavior—hence, label the individual.

People tend to support systems and enterprises in which they have a vested and real stake.[14] The virtue of the youth service bureau movement is that it gives the local citizen an opportunity to gain a share in the design, building, and operation of a community institution serving local children and youth. No matter how positive in its approach, a public agency, because of a myriad of formal rules and regulations governing behavior, is

unable to relate directly or personally with the individuals of the community it attempts to serve. Most public agencies have restrictions, even prohibitions, against positive participation by the clientele. The youth service bureau, at least in part, begins to address the issue by offering the community a program in which the children and the adults of given communities can participate, can give of themselves, can have a stake in their own enterprise.

III. Methodology

In the fields of youth development and delinquency prevention, where facts are hard to establish, one obvious "fact" is that people are not all alike—communities are not all alike—and youth service bureaus are not all alike.

Although goals and objectives of different programs may be similar, the reasons for these objectives and means for achieving them may be quite different. The national study of youth service bureaus did not arbitrarily hypothesize what a youth service bureau should be and then seek out programs that met the definition. Instead, the study sought out programs that others identified as youth service bureaus—programs with similar problems, goals, and procedures along with influences that were significant in shaping the nature of bureaus in different communities. The project sought to locate and describe youth service bureaus in whatever form and by whatever name others identified them.

The national study of youth service bureaus utilized what Dr. John M. Martin called the classic "butterfly collector's" survey method.[15] In the style of the experienced collector who had a good idea of what a butterfly looks like and how, for example, a butterfly differs from a sparrow or an American eagle, project staff searched nationally for projects believed by informants to be youth service bureaus. If a Governor, State planning agent, Federal bureaucrat, or public agency thought a particular program was a youth service bureau, staff attempted to catch up with it, examine it, and match it with other youth service bureaus (butterflies) with similar characteristics. In the process, a few doves and hawks were eliminated because they really were not butterflies at all. No effort was made to identify "the typical or the best form of youth service bureau." Instead, project staff grouped programs with similar problems, goals, procedures, and operations for serving youth either directly or indirectly as a way of trying to describe and classify the elusive youth service bureaus of the President's Crime Commission.

Locating Youth Service Bureaus

The study identified a significant number of youth service bureau programs throughout the United States which have funding from Federal

sources. A number of other programs which existed prior to, or independent of, Federal funding were also located and described.

The study began in late September 1971, with a national census. Officials and agencies in the 50 States and six territories were contacted through 300 inquiries sent out to Governors, State planning agencies, regional offices of Federal Government, and State or local juvenile correctional agencies.

There was response from every State and territory with over 300 programs recommended as likely prospects for study. After screening out duplicates and other obvious nonprograms (i.e., Boy Scouts, Little League, general YMCA programs, etc.) from the preliminary census, questionnaires were sent out. The questionnaires were sent directly to the administrators of programs identified by others as youth service bureaus. Information accumulated gave an indication as to: (1) number and location; (2) auspices; (3) functions; (4) services; (5) types of cases served; (6) nature of services provided; (7) number of staff; (8) involvement of volunteers; (9) organizational structure; and (10) basis of financial support.

The Sorting Task

Questionnaires were mailed to 272 possible youth service bureaus. Ten of these programs were later found to be duplicates. The adjusted total for questionnaires mailed was 262. The net response was 222 out of 262, or 85 percent. Of the 222 responses, 198 questionnaires were completed with sufficient information for analysis. The remaining 24 acknowledged the questionnaire, indicating that it was inappropriate to their program or that they were no longer in operation. Two specialty programs from Washington, D.C., with funding in excess of $2 million, dealt with employment and truancy. These programs were not included in the comparative figures, although a few of the services provided did coincide with youth service bureau programs in other places. Both indicated that they did not categorize themselves as youth service bureaus because they were highly specialized. The questionnaire response from the Los Angeles County School District was in regard to a general counseling program for all youth in the school district. This program was also deleted for comparison purposes.

The remaining 195 programs were analyzed. Although there were many shades of program, approximately 170 appeared to be significantly related to the youth service bureau *concept*. Some of the definitional problems encountered follow:

Seven programs, mostly in Florida, with one in the Virgin Islands, were residential treatment programs for adjudicated delinquents and/or dependent children. In most cases they were group homes and served traditional correctional agency needs for residential care. One additional program, in North Carolina, was identified as a juvenile hall.

The New York programs offered the next dilemma. Questionnaires were mailed to 37 programs. There were returns from 26, and, of these, 24 operated under the auspices of the New York Division of Youth Services and

were known as youth boards. The programs from the 11 locations not responding were also youth boards. Of the 24 youth board programs, 17 responded that they considered themselves youth service bureaus, four responded that they were uncertain, and three responded that they were not.

The New York youth board program makes recommendations as to youth programs in the community with funds from the State of New York. These funds amount to less than one dollar per year for each youth under the age of 18 years. The 24 programs responding represented a minimum of $7 million and involved three quarters of a million youth. All 24 responses listed coordination as a significant objective or function, and service rendered was usually to other agencies involved in youth development or delinquency prevention. The most frequently sponsored service is recreation, although some boards emphasize information and referral services which try to put a youth in touch with a specific agency that can benefit his particular need; employment referral, drug information, etc., which may be very much like youth service bureaus represented in other areas.

There were three school-based programs which ranged from general counseling to those which specifically addressed themselves to school truancy and behavior problems. Several programs concentrated on indirect rather than direct service. In essence, they worked with groups who worked with groups.

There were about five such programs, and these too varied in purpose from general welfare of youth to specific diversion from the juvenile justice system. Another group of programs were housed within police departments or were police administered. There were seven such programs. Four considered that they were youth service bureaus, two considered that they were not, and one was uncertain. There were also 10 to 12 programs which created definitional problems. In these programs the main or principal interest was in such matters as supplementary probation supervision, recreation, employment, drug counseling, and other specialties.

One hundred and thirty-six programs had similar characteristics insofar as having similar objectives (i.e., diversion from the juvenile justice system, delinquency prevention, youth and community development); target population (i.e., primarily youth between 10 and 18 and with special consideration to those in jeopardy of becoming involved in the juvenile justice system); and a variety of services i.e., counseling, referral, individual casework, cultural enrichment activities). Even here, there was a great variation among the programs depending on the size and political nature of the community: different emphasis as to methods of delivering service, staff providing service, and the leadership of each program.

Program Selection

On December 15, 16, and 17, 1971, the National Advisory Committee, two representatives of the Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention

Administration, Professor John Martin of Fordham University (Consultant to the Playa Ponce Youth Service Bureau), the project director, and associate project director met to select 55 youth service bureaus. Staff of the project and the National Advisory Committee used the following criteria in selecting projects for onsite visits:

1. **Geography:** *To the extent possible, programs operating throughout the West, Midwest, East, North, and South were selected. Within these geographic areas, programs representing metropolitan, rural, and suburban areas were also included.*

2. **Community Involvement:** *To what extent did public and private agencies, along with private citizens, support the identified program and to what extent were groups and individuals involved in planning and implementing the services offered?*

3. **Program:** *What were the services offered and what rationale existed for the specific services that had been developed for the given youth service bureau identified?*

4. **Uniqueness of Target Area:** *Was there something special about the target area? Did it represent some special problem, group, or issue that was easily identified?*

5. **Visibility:** *Was the program itself identified as an operating organization or was it simply a smaller part of some larger existing program? Did it have special organizational identity and the ability to command its own financial support?*

IV. General Findings

Responses to mail-out questionnaires and other written material provided general reference information as to different types of programs identified as youth service bureaus. Some of the residential treatment programs, youth board programs, and specialty programs were like, or had many elements of, programs similar to general youth service bureau programs; others did not. Emphasis of this section is in regard to the more typical programs.

Number of Youth Served

It is estimated that for 12 months in 1971–72, approximately 50,000 youth, who were in immediate jeopardy of the juvenile justice system, received direct services from approximately 140 youth service bureaus. At least an additional 150,000 youth, who were from the respective target areas, but not in immediate jeopardy of the juvenile justice system, were also participants in the programs.

Typical Program

It is impossible to isolate the "average man." He can be described, discussed, and counted, but he is not exactly like anyone else. As a composite, he is unique as well as imaginary. The same may be said of the "average" youth service bureau. The following composite description is drawn from an analysis of 195 written responses to questionnaires and/or other information.

Typical programs had five to six full-time staff and either had or were developing programs utilizing the services of from one to 50 volunteers. The annual budget was from $50,000 to $75,000. The objectives were diversion from the juvenile justice system, delinquency prevention and youth development.

Individual counseling and referral were the most important services for at least 75 percent of the programs responding. Included were referral with general followup; family counseling; group counseling; drug treatment; job referral; tutoring and remedial education; recreation programs; medical aid; and legal aid.

At least two-thirds of the programs were located in an urban, core city, or Model City neighborhoods. Socioeconomic conditions for the areas were

usually considered lower income with a high crime rate, unemployment, and limited facilities most often noted. The target group was adolescents (14–17 years of age).

The ethnic distribution of programs answering questionnaires was: predominantly white 25 percent, predominantly black 15 percent, predominantly Latin 5 percent. In addition, 20 percent of the programs were mixed between whites and blacks; 10 percent between whites and Latins; and 5 percent predominantly Latin and black. Twenty percent of the programs had most ethnic groups represented.

The "typical" program provided intensive services for 350 cases per year; about 60 percent were male and 40 percent female. The average age was 15.5 years. Primary sources of referral were school, law enforcement, and self. Primary reasons for referral were unacceptable behavior, personal difficulties, or some professional services needs. Drugs and delinquency were the primary reasons for police referral. Approximately 25 percent of the programs were open Monday through Friday for a total of 40 hours per week. The remaining 75 percent worked in excess of this, usually 41 to 72 hours throughout the entire week.

The evaluation component for programs ranged from no evaluation to extensive evaluation.

Patterns of Organization

The organization of youth service bureaus ranged from a "one-man operation" with a few volunteers to a sizeable unit of government. This range of organizational pattern is due in part to the various interpretations given to the President's Crime Commission report about what constitutes a youth service bureau. However, it also reflects the needs, resources, attitudes, and priorities of the community and different levels of government and funding sources.

The matter of auspices has been a point of considerable discussion regarding youth service bureaus. There are those who argue that it should be a public agency, closely identified with government; others argue for a private agency, independent of government; and still others seem to prefer some compromise between the two absolute extremes. The study showed that the majority of youth service bureaus involve participation by some unit of State or local government.

Complexity of Program Administration

It is difficult not to be amazed at the number of layers of government, organizations and individuals between those receiving the service and the funding source. For example, some programs received funds from four Federal sources (LEAA, HEW, Model Cities, and the Labor Department)—all with different funding dates. The program may also have several political entities at the local level, as well as the State level, for approval of

cash and "in kind" match in order to obtain the Federal funds. This is in addition to advisory groups, organizations, managing boards, and informal influences of groups and of powerful individuals. These various individuals and groups may not have the same objectives as the funding source, let alone the same objectives as the layers of government between them; and, last but not least, they may not have the same idea of service needs as the people who are the "target population." It becomes clear that those responsible for programs serve many masters.

Funding

A discussion of youth service bureaus is hardly possible without an examination of funding. It is an understatement to comment that funding fluctuates and is uncertain. For the most part, programs are dependent on Federal funds for primary support and local resources for "in kind" services. Programs are often beholden for funds from sources where the representatives are their severest critics and competitors for available money.

When the *Omnibus Crime Control Act* and the *Juvenile Delinquency Act* first made funds available, there was a search for new and innovative programs. The youth service bureau idea captured the imagination of many because it was seen as an immediate solution with high visibility. Although more Federal money has become available, State criminal justice planning agencies now tend to give greater priority to law enforcement and rehabilitation than prevention. Not only have the police and correctional programs become more adept at submitting successful proposals for funding, but procedures have become more institutionalized, favoring traditional agencies over alternate programs which, no matter how subtle, challenge established governmental agencies for money and responsibility.

Of 188 programs responding to the question regarding funding, 155 had some Federal funding amounting to less than $15 million. The most significant source of funding was from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration which invested in 135 of the 155 programs. Hence, the most critical problem facing youth service bureaus throughout the country today can be summed up in a single word, "funding"!

People Providing Service

To a great extent, the *staff* of the youth service bureaus *are* the *programs* of the youth service bureaus. Perhaps no group brings more energy, training, character, and experience to the fledgling youth service bureau programs than the project directors. They are key people and their talents are needed; yet, the majority of programs are not only in danger of going out of business, but also of losing leadership due to the uncertain funding future, long hours, and hard work.

Youth service bureau employees are atypical of traditional social agency staff. They are people of great contrast who learn from one another. Their manner of dress is neat and casual but with a ring of youth and the times.

Their style of talking with people is straightforward and without the language of bureaucracy. They are the people who maintain the principal contact with clientele. They "meet the client where he is."

Program Participants

Clientele, as described by the President's Crime Commission Report, are "a group now handled, for the most part, either inappropriately or not at all, except in time of crisis." [16] Clients interviewed during the course of this study met this criteria. The overall reasons for referral and sources of referral supported the contention that program participants were youth in jeopardy of the juvenile justice system. Yet an important characteristic of the young people who come to youth service bureaus for any reason is their need to contribute to, as well as participate in, program. The youth service bureau is a place where youth can serve as well as come to be served. Youth who come to the bureau seeking service frequently become deliverers of service and implementors of program.

More than half of all referrals to the youth service bureaus contacted (50.9 percent) were for unacceptable behavior, i.e., youth in jeopardy of processing in the juvenile justice system but whose behavior would not have been illegal if engaged in by an adult.

Although law enforcement and schools were the most frequent sources of referral, approximately 18 percent each, no single source was dominant. The number of referrals from unofficial sources approximated 40 percent (i.e., parents, self, friends). More than half the females were self-referrals. Self-referrals appear to be older with a median age of 16.8. The overall pattern of referrals suggests that many of the participants and their families were waiting for the services that youth service bureau programs began to provide.

Primary Objectives of Youth Service Bureaus

Although diversion from the juvenile justice system was reported to be the primary objective by the majority of the directors (63.8 percent), this response diminished the further one moved down to the administrative hierarchy. Staff in general tended to emphasize goals that were broad in focus, such as delinquency prevention and youth development. Program participants tended to see the objectives of the bureaus as practical help to people with problems; help with family problems; individual help; help to keep out of trouble. Overall, participants seemed to view the programs as service agencies for young people.

Diversion

It is not known when the term "diversion" became a part of the vocabulary associated with youth service bureaus, but it was and is as badly defined as the term bureau itself. Mixing justice system processes with nonjustice

services, the term diversion has been applied to almost any discretionary action available to a public or private agency dealing with children and youth. Only recently has the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration attempted to define diversion as an objective and observable program offered in lieu of justice system processing between the period of arrest and adjudication.[17]

V. Program Examples

Youth service bureau programs tend to focus on the special problems of youth in the community.[18] The youth service bureaus serve as a bridge between the needs of youth and the attitudes of the adult community. In communities where both exist, bureaus serve as a bridge between traditional agencies for social service and justice and unorthodox organizations also providing service to youth.

Overall, the youth service bureau movement is permeated by an attitude of concern and dedication to making gentle the lives of the people.

To the extent that a bureau's objective is diversion, then the bureaus most capable of diversion are those that have a linkage to the juvenile justice system, maintaining immediate communication, but that are not coopted by the justice system, its traditionally most powerful leaders, or its existing practices.

Coordinated planning such as this presumes that the community and its justice system are characterized by a strong sense of cooperation. For less cohesive communities, diversion may only come about much more painstakingly after the bureau begins operation, using individual and system advocacy to encourage justice agencies to change their way of handling children and youth.

The planning process for a diversionary bureau is illustrated by efforts carried out in Pacifica, Calif. Here the probation department hosted a meeting for administrators from several related agencies to discuss the need, concept, and possible services and direction of a youth service bureau. A smaller community team, with the police and probation departments providing the core leadership, developed the plans in more detail.

The youth services project in San Antonio, Tex., provides an example of how an administrative policy change by the police department is bringing about diversion in that city. The police chief has ordered all officers to deliver juveniles picked up for such offenses as glue or paint sniffing, liquor violations, runaway, ungovernable and disorderly conduct, truancy, or loitering to one of three project neighborhood centers in the city.

Availability of bureau staff to immediately respond to a case being handled by the police also increases the likelihood that diversion will take place in San Antonio. The youth services project places bilingual intake workers

in the juvenile aid bureau of the police department at night and on weekends to guarantee immediate followup on a case.

The immediacy of service and the convenient physical location of the bureau saves police a long drive to juvenile hall, i.e., three centers are located in housing projects of the target area. Location is a stimulant to implementing a diversion policy.

Accessibility of the bureau's offices to law enforcement is another asset in encouraging diversion. The Rhode Island Youth Service Bureau's regular work hours are 2 p.m. until 10 p.m., a fact greatly appreciated by the Providence Police Department. Until recently, the Youth Services Bureau of Greensboro, Inc., in North Carolina, was located across the street from the police department. Not only did this permit bureau staff to daily pick up "paper referrals" from the police department, but it also increased understanding between the police department's juvenile officers and the bureau staff during the youth service bureau's developmental stages. A similar effort exists in Seattle, Wash., where the center for youth services and the police department have cooperatively developed a social agency referral project for youth in trouble.

Detaching law enforcement officers from the juvenile division to work full-time in the bureau is another method of increasing the confidence of the police department and thereby enhancing diversion. This method is utilized in east San Jose, Calif., with the role of the police officers clearly agreed upon in advance. The police officers are viewed as a part of the youth service bureau program rather than the police establishment. This is done in order to protect the confidential, noncoercive stance of the bureau.

After the youth service bureau was established in 1971 in Dekalb, Ill., each of the 86 youth arrested by the police department were referred to the youth service bureau; none were referred to the court system. Only 20 of the 86 again came to the attention of the police department. All were again referred to the youth service bureau. Court statistics for youth from Dekalb reflect this policy change.

In many communities where law enforcement has been closely involved with establishing the youth service bureau, the bureau has found it necessary to break down distrust among the young people it serves. Only after a period of providing services have some of the bureaus successfully developed a reputation of providing voluntary and confidential service.

One of the most pervasive areas of controversy in the youth-service-bureau movement is whether a bureau should develop and provide services itself or should function principally as an information and referral service, following up with individual advocacy or case coordination for the young people it refers.

Most youth service bureaus have focused primarily on developing alternative services to fill the gaps in the community rather than facilitating

access to ongoing services. Thus, they provide direct service more often than refer youth to other agencies for service.

The fundamental strength of most bureaus has been in their provision of a variety of innovative services for youth—services that include counseling, tutoring, job referrals and other employment services, crisis intervention, crisis shelter care, and medical services, generally provided at accessible locations and hours in an appealing manner to their clients. Moreover, several of the bureaus that provide direct service also provide referral services—followup, individual advocacy, and service brokerage.

Where a youth service bureau's office is the focal point of activities, accessibility has been increased by locating near a school or in a business and commercial area frequented by young people. In rural areas or other communities with widely dispersed populations, some bureaus (such as the Tri-County Youth Services Bureau in Hughesville, Md.) have opened one-day-a-week outreach centers in churches and other locations.

Accessibility has been improved over many traditional agencies by maintaining evening and weekend office hours. Youth service bureaus seeking to assist youth with problems make their services available to young people not only through accessible locations and hours but by instituting hotlines, drop-in centers, and outreach workers.

In some communities, youth service bureaus operate hotlines—anonymous listener services which young people with problems can call. Examples of hotlines linked to youth service bureaus include those in Peru, Ind.; Palatine, Ill.; Shamokin, Pa.; and El Paso, Tex. In these communities, volunteers staff telephones so that young people with personal crises can call in and discuss problems anonymously with a concerned, trained listener. In many instances, the telephone conversation is the only assistance needed. However, the volunteer listener refers the young person to the bureau or another resource if further help is necessary. In Palatine, college students receive credit for volunteering to staff the hotline. Although it does not operate a hotline, the Hughesville, Md., bureau urges young people with problems to call collect, thus overcoming economic and transportation barriers to accessibility. Youth in need of the services of Manteca House in California can receive free transportation from a local cab company.

A more aggressive approach to reaching out to young people is seen in the use of outreach or street workers. Many of the outreach workers go where groups of youth gather—in order to link individual youth to services, to divert the groups into constructive activities or to attempt to prevent confrontations between young people and the police. Traditionally, outreach workers have worked with gangs in urban areas, but in many of the youth service bureaus located in suburban communities, outreach workers have instead attempted to involve unaffiliated and alienated youth in purposeful activities. In Pacifica, Calif., high school and college age students are employed by the youth service bureau as outreach workers, with a few assigned to each of the young people's gathering places, including the beach in this

suburban town. In Fairmount Heights, Md., the roving youth leader program concentrates on an outreach approach. This program sends five part-time teams, each composed of a young adult male and high school student, into the community to provide positive role models and to encourage idle youth to participate in the roving leader's recreation programs and community services.

Although it has been suggested that counseling should not be the primary service of a youth service bureau, it is, in fact, the nucleus of many bureaus. It also appears that many of the activities of the youth service bureaus are inadvertently obscured by the term counseling, since the counseling services for youth also requires bureau staff to deal with problems that are broader than those initially presented by the youth. Solutions to these broader problems sometimes require serving as an advocate for youth with other institutions in the community.

The bureaus in Wayzata and St. Louis Park, Minn., and Boulder, Colo., specialize in counseling "counter culture youth." In Tulsa, Okla., and Santa Rosa, Calif., bureaus emphasize one-to-one counseling and practical assistance through the use of volunteers. In Portland, Oreg., professional workers volunteer to offer their specialized skills and knowledge to young people needing this type of practical help. Paraprofessionals are the primary counseling-outreach staff in Brooklyn, N.Y., and New Bedford, Mass.

Counseling of young people, many of them runaways, is a primary program in the Youth Services Bureau of Greensboro, N.C. Accessibility is greatly magnified by the staff's willingness to respond immediately to youth in trouble—regardless of the day or hour. This program is unique in its ability to gain the confidence of youth in trouble while maintaining the respect of other agencies in the community. A demonstration of the confidentiality that exists is that staff do not take any action without the young person's knowledge. Police and staff have agreed that staff, provided they notify the police when they know the whereabouts of a runaway, can continue to work with the runaway and need not turn him or her in.

Family counseling is a frequently provided service in Maricopa County Youth Service Bureau in Arizona, San Diego and Pacifica, Calif. This is in sharp contrast to Greensboro's services, where the focus of the bureau's counseling is the youth himself and on developing his responsibilities. In Pacific, the agreement is generally for five counseling sessions. Families in need of long-term treatment are referred to other agencies.

Hughesville, Md., and Tri-County Community Center in Jackson, Miss., offer diagnosis and evaluation prior to counseling. In El Paso, Tex., where court approval is required before any youth under 16 can drop out of school, the juvenile court requires youngsters to first be counseled by the youth service bureau. The bureau attempts to solve the underlying problems, such as employment, and then makes its recommendation to the court regarding leaving school.

A drop-in center primarily frequented by youth experiencing identity problems characterizes the Glastonbury, Conn., Youth Service Bureau. Individual conjoint family and group counseling are the main services provided.

The Youth Intercept Project of Kansas City, Mo., does not provide traditional casework services. Instead, it helps the child survive and stay in school and helps his family get what they need in order to allow that kind of success.

In the Bronx, the neighborhood youth diversion program and in East Palo Alto, Calif., the community youth responsibility project have developed a program on the premise that indigenous people who know the problems and who have had minimal training in conciliation and arbitration techniques can help resolve interpersonal and interfamily problems without relying on the formal judicial system.

In Los Angeles County, the Bassett Youth Service Bureau focuses on strengthening the community's efforts to meet youth needs. It developed a free clinic in conjunction with other community groups, staffed primarily by volunteers. It includes a counseling and drop-in center in addition to an outpatient medical clinic. Venereal disease, pregnancies, and drug abuse are among the most frequently treated medical problems.

Individually tailored service provided by the bureaus has occasionally been supplemented by purchase of services. For example, the Tucson, Ariz., Youth Service Bureau supplements its range of services by contracting for services for its clients, including remedial reading.

Coordination of services for individual youth is taking place through case conferences, e.g., in Worcester, Mass., and Howard County, Ind., representatives of all agencies involved with the youth meet in an attempt to attain a complete view of the problem and to develop a comprehensive plan to meet the youth's needs. The program in San Angelo, Tex., emphasizes linking-up community resources for youth through conferences and training workshops. Special programs of coordination, counseling, and direct services for blacks are found in Louisville, Ky. and Columbus, Ohio. The program in Bowling Green, Ky. is similar, but serves a racially mixed population with a racially mixed staff known as the Mod Squad. The Youth Services Bureau of Tarrant County (Fort Worth, Tex.) emphasizes its role as a crisis intervention service by attempting to understand each client's problem and make a referral to the most appropriate agency.

Advocacy is another role some bureaus fulfill. The most notable example of this is the youth service bureau in Ponce, P.R., Youth and Community Alerted. Here, 12 young people are trained to act as advocates for youth who have come in contact with the police or the juvenile court, or are in danger of becoming delinquent. In addition, the bureau and its leadership are advocates for community improvements, i.e., better sanitation, drug abuse prevention, and improved educational facilities.

In Bridgeport, Conn., one staff member of the youth service bureau appears in juvenile court each day to "stand up" for young people for whom they feel they can provide service. And in Fairmount Heights, Md., Roving Youth Leaders staff act as a third party with school authorities and juveniles in instances where parents or guardians are unwilling to act.

Meeting the needs for shelter has been a subgoal in several bureaus. The Omaha, Nebr., YMCA Youth Service Bureau operates a group home which is responsive to the runaway problem and emphasizes family reconciliation. Whether a youth stays is his choice, but parental permission is required.

The Youth Crisis Center, Inc., in Jackson, Miss., provides shelter and services up to 5 days for a few youth at a time who come to it for help. Parents are not contacted unless the youth agrees. Professional volunteers, including medical and legal people, supplement the small staff.

In Scottsdale, Ariz., the youth service bureau is located in a four-bedroom home, with two of the bedrooms used as offices and two for youth to stay if they need overnight accommodations. If the youth is under 18, parental consent is required.

The youth service bureau in Boise, Idaho, provides temporary shelter care in lieu of incarceration. In Las Cruces, N. Mex., the Council for Youth operates a group home for boys, most of whom remain there for a few months. The council's outreach program provides aftercare. The Youth Action Commission in Arvada, Colo., operates a group home for girls requiring short-term placement.

The Yuba-Sutter Youth Service Bureau in California developed crisis homes where youth could stay for short periods of time. These crisis homes were private homes volunteered for short-term care. Volunteer homes were paid a nominal sum per day for expenses.

Programs for groups of youth and parents are to be found in many of the youth service bureaus—or organized by the bureaus in several communities. These group programs include new approaches to youth-police relations, education, and parental education.

The El Paso, Tex., Youth Services Bureau bridges gaps in understanding between youth and police by its youth patrol, youth-police dialogues, and youth-police recreation program. The youth patrol permits youth to spend 4 hours on patrol with a police officer during periods of high activity. The youth-police dialogue involve antiauthority youth and selected police officers in encounter sessions, under the supervision of psychiatrists. The youth-police recreation program pairs an off-duty police officer with a selected youth-police recreation program. The youth patrol permits police to establish communication with young people in a neighborhood and develop constructive programs in cooperation with the neighborhood's residents.

Rap sessions (informal group discussions) take place in several of the bureaus, with Cambridge, Mass. among the bureaus holding them most regularly.

In the Tri-County Youth Services Bureau in Hughesville, Md., staff are joined by correctional camp inmates in leading group counseling for boys who have been referred to the bureau. Inmates are driven to the bureau one evening a week to participate in this program.

The Palama Settlement of Hawaii has a successful ongoing "behavior modification school" program for court referrals and rejects from the regular schools. The youth advocacy program in South Bend, Ind., contracts for a "street academy," an alternative school program for junior high and high school youth who have dropped out of the regular schools. In Ann Arbor, Mich., the Washtenaw Youth Service Bureau, funded through the school system, has set up an alternative school program.

In Kansas City, Mo., the program instituted art classes in several schools to which problem children are referred. A prominent local artist teaches these classes, including discussion of social problems that relate to the content of the art.

One of the first steps of coordinated planning of programs is information gathering and distribution. A thorough and systematic approach to this is seen in the Youth Services Bureau of Wake-Forest University, in Winston-Salem, N.C. This bureau does not provide direct services to juveniles. Instead, it has developed a comprehensive, communitywide approach to coordinated planning of youth opportunities. Young people, as well as agency representatives, participated in the planning.

In other efforts to systematically plan and create change in existing institutions, the Youth Services Bureau of Wake-Forest University has conducted a study of attitudes and knowledge of drug abuse; a study of drug use; a participant-observation study among black youth on factors preventing their becoming involved in recreation and character development programs; and a survey to determine what recreation or youth opportunities low income white youth would like to see developed.

The Youth Development Service in Billings, Mont., and the rural America project operating out of Helena, Mont., provide consultant and technical assistance to a variety of other social service agencies in their respective areas. Coordination efforts bring agencies together to agree on community priorities, to eliminate service duplication, and to redirect resources where current projects are inappropriate, Morreltown, Ark., uses a technique referred to as "resource management" to meet the needs of rural youth.

The Washtenaw Youth Service Bureau in Ann Arbor, Mich., emphasizes the initiation of programs for young people who, although troubled and acting out, have not yet had contact with the justice system. It has published a youth services guide, which is to be updated every 3 months. It conducts demonstration projects, primarily in the schools, and attempts to develop skills and resources within the system.

The youth advocacy program in South Bend, Ind., also attempts to get youth-serving agencies to develop new ways of dealing with young people. Their methods are positive proposals and involvement. Field workers are

assigned to five youth-serving agencies—the recreation department, schools, a family and child agency, city government, and Model Cities—with the task of making them more responsive to youth needs.

The program examples cited often effect social change and systems modification as well as provide direct services. For example, the decision structures in the youth service bureau in Winston-Salem, N.C., and the youth advocacy program in South Bend, Ind., both include recipients of the services. While this characteristic does not further interagency coordination by rapidly providing the program with power to coordinate resources, it nonetheless institutes the beginnings of a power base which can ultimately bring about changes in the system of social and judicial services.

This approach requires a sense of security that the program will continue to exist beyond a single funding year. It also requires continually training, developing, and invoking young people in the decisionmaking for the bureau. Only in this way will the youth service bureau evolve to meet the needs of the middle and late 1970's, as today's youth themselves become recognized as established leaders of the adult community.

Youth service bureau programs tend to focus on the special problems of youth in the community. The youth service bureaus serve as a bridge between the needs of youth and the attitudes of the adult community. In communities where both exist, bureaus serve as a bridge between traditional agencies for social service, justice, and unorthodox organizations also providing service to youth.

VI. Summary and Conclusion

Youth service bureaus are as varied and different as the people and the locations in which they are found; yet, they demonstrate certain similar and important characteristics. For example, almost without exception, youth service bureaus are pioneering new organizational models for delivering services to children and youth. They are, in a limited way, transforming traditional bureaucratic models into flexible service systems which freely and directly cater to the differing needs of children and youth throughout America. Within the communities they serve, youth service bureaus deliver practical and direct services to children and youth in need.

Organizational Principles

The national study identified four main influences as having significance in the development, organization, and primary service of youth service bureaus. They were:

(1) *The nature of the community*
(2) *The power base*
(3) *The orientation of staff*
(4) *The funding sources*

These influences, in turn, suggested a series of principles for those promoting or implementing a youth service bureau:

1. The organization and program must remain flexible in order to respond to the unique needs and unanticipated problems of the community it serves but without undue reliance on traditional bureaucratic responses.

2. The program must be prepared to deal objectively and effectively with the powerful in the community, including those who believe in a punitive and deterrent course of action.

3. Whatever the staff orientation, the program implemented must be a real substitute for other courses of action, particularly if the object is to reduce the likelihood of recurring delinquency, minimize stigmatization or maintain youth who are in jeopardy of the criminal justice system.

4. The program must be organized in such a manner that the favorable public bias for children and youth is used to full advantage.

5. Research and evaluation must be included as a part of program developments if there is to be systematic organizational change based on fact rather than prejudice and hunch.

Target Area

Community forces affecting youth service bureaus express themselves in many ways. For example, if a college or university is located in the target area, the services offered focus on program, and the types of clientele served will differ from a similar program operating in a ghetto or a "bed-room" community. Population characteristics, social or economic status, physical characteristics of the community, and the auspices under which the program operates are all critical factors affecting the nature of the program offered as well as its success. Who sponsors the youth service bureau is less important than whether or not the sponsoring body has enough power and commitment to see the program carried through.

Funding

Bureaus with some assurances of continuous funding are able to operate effective programs that can be adapted to changing needs and circumstances. The expansion and continued development of youth service bureau models depends upon increased funding, but in the long run, stability of supporting revenues is the more critical issue.

Staff

Staff is the single most important ingredient of the youth service bureau. Enthusiastic and committed people are essential to program, yet this energy will lead to little unless staff are aware of and sensitive to the power structure of the community (and its affect on program). Staff of youth service bureaus are sometimes at a disadvantage in dealing with private and/or governmental hierarchies that influence and control programs. Nevertheless, leaders who have successful youth service bureaus possess the tenacity, energy, sensitivity, and charisma to deal effectively with the most powerful forces in the community, while at the same time being able to relate to the least powerful and socially primitive individuals and groups in that community.

Program Content

Most youth service bureaus provide at least one standard service, e.g., some form of counseling. Unlike traditional case service agencies, counseling in youth service bureaus is geared to action and change. In many cases, an initial counseling problem requires the bureau to become an advocate around a specific community problem that effects more children than the

one child presenting the initial problem, e.g., remedial education, improved health services, etc.

Most successful bureaus offer practical programs of assistance to young people such as tutoring, medical treatment, legal aide, temporary housing, and recreation. Some, but not the majority, use referrals to other agencies or purchase of service for those services they cannot provide directly.

Other important services include planning, training, consultation, case conferencing, advocacy, and serving as host for other agency activities such as community fairs, craft displays, open houses, educational rap sessions, and other efforts that bring in a broad cross section of the community for information and participative action.

Conclusion

The effective youth service bureau involves good programing plus operational knowledge by staff about how to effectively use the resources of the community. Successful bureau directors use their knowledge to work through the red tape normally found in governmental bureaucracies.

A good youth service bureau is program plus know how.

The effective youth service bureau is one where youth can relate. It is a place where youth gains by giving, where youth come because of personal needs and often resolve those needs by serving others. Almost without exception, clientele of youth service bureaus are people who want to belong, want to share, and want to give of themselves. This characteristic of giving and wanting to be a part of something larger than themselves is found in such divergent places as an affluent suburb like Wayzata, Minn., or in the New York inner city.

In 1972, youth service bureaus were primarily models for delivering direct services to children and youth. In this sense, bureaus are a pioneering example of a service delivery component for a broader effort now identified as a comprehensive youth service delivery system (i.e., a total system which brings together and organizes resources for all children and youth in a given target area in ways that increase the effectiveness of the services provided).

Ultimately, every society is forced to examine the services it offers in terms of cost effectiveness. Today in the United States, over $12 billion are spent annually on programs advancing youth services. Because the programs are fragmented with each operating agency requiring its own overhead, staff, policy and administration, and insisting on dealing with only one part of the child, there is little evidence that the $12 billion is being used effectively. Yet, in spite of this, a few youth service bureaus, greatly underfunded and outside of the "real" money, are making a difference.

On the basis of total national resources assigned to the youth service bureau in 1972 (less than $15 million), it is unreasonable to expect youth service bureaus to be able to command either the careful attention or

authority that would permit greater coordination of existing youth service agencies now spending billions of dollars. The fact that some bureaus have been able to coordinate and to serve as advocates for youth services is a glowing tribute to the staff and the community in which these few programs exist.

Whether or not the youth service bureau movement survives and transforms itself into what is now called "comprehensive youth service systems" will be determined by time and the commitment of the public and private agencies to consider reordering their priorities for delivering services to children and youth. The youth service bureau has demonstrated very clearly that there are flexible and better alternatives for the traditional ways of providing youth services. Further, it has demonstrated that a small number of commited people (overwhelmingly young) armed, with even minimal resources, can begin to effectively address some of the most critical problems facing the new American majority—the Nation's youth.

Appendices

Footnotes

1. *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society,* a report by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., February 1967, p. 279.
2. *Ibid,* p. 7.
3. U.S. Government, Task Force on Juvenile Delinquency. *The Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, Report on Juvenile Justice and Consultants Papers.* President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Washington: GPO, 1967, p. 20.
4. LaMar T. Empey and Steven G. Lubeck, *Delinquency Prevention Strategies,* U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration, 1970.
5. Robert D. Vinter, *Justice for the Juvenile: Myth or Reality?* Lecture presented at the University of Delaware under the auspices of E. Paul DuPont Endowment for the Study of Crime and Delinquency in Corrections, Newark, Del., Mar. 26, 1969.
6. Robert J. Gemignani, "Youth Services Systems," in *Delinquency Prevention Reporter,* U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration, July–August 1972.
7. Ted Rubin, "Law As An Agent of Delinquency Prevention," paper prepared for the Delinquency Prevention Strategy Conference, California Youth Authority and California Council on Criminal Justice, Santa Barbara, February 1970.
8. Irving Piliavin and Scott Briar, "Police Encounters with Juveniles," *American Journal of Sociology,* September 1964.
9. Edwin M. Lemert, *Instead of Court: Diversion in Juvenile Justice,* National Institute of Mental Health, Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency, Chevy Chase, Md., 1971.
10. John M. Martin, *Toward a Political Definition of Delinquency Prevention,* U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration, 1970.
11. Margaret K. Rosenheim, "Youth Service Bureaus: a Concept in Search and Definition," *Juvenile Court Judges Journal,* 20(2), 69–74, 1969.
12. Vinter, *Op. Cit.*
13. Lemert, *Op. Cit.*
14. Robert Sutermeister, *People and Productivity, McGraw-Hill,* 2d Edition, 1969.
15. This analogy was contributed by Professor John Martin, Fordham University at the first meeting of the National Advisory Committee in Playa Ponce, P.R., Dec. 16, 1971.
16. *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society, Op. Cit.,* p. 83.
17. *The Commission on Standards and Goals, Task Force on Corrections,* Chapter on Diversion, currently in preparation: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Washington, D.C., December 1972.
18. Examples taken from: *The National Study of Youth Service Bureaus,* prepared for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Social Rehabilitation, Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration, by the Department of the California Youth Authority, Sacramento, Calif., October 1972.

Bibliography

"Articles of Incorporation of Youth Service Bureau of Boise, Idaho, Inc. A Non-Profit Corporation," Mimeographed paper, executed June 22, 1971.

This is an example of legal papers of incorporation which specifies the aims and goals of youth service bureaus.

Burns, Virginia, and Leonard Stern. "The Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency," *Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime*. Task Force on Juvenile Delinquency, The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Washington: GPO, 1967, pp. 353–409.

The authors have asked for a national strategy regarding youth development and delinquency prevention. On page 396 they discuss alternatives to judicial handling.

California, State of. *California Welfare and Institutions Code*. Section 1900–1905, "Chapter 9 Youth Service Bureaus," 1968 ch. 934.

This statute made provisions for establishing youth service bureaus in California. It provides background in regard to the emphasis placed on coordination and other aspects of youth service bureaus in that State.

California, State of, Department of the Youth Authority. *Youth Service Bureaus: Standards and Guidelines*. [William Underwood,] California Delinquency Prevention Commission, October 1968.

This publication was developed to provide public and private organizations with a guide to make application for youth service bureau grant funds in California. It gives purpose of the California Youth Service Bureau Act and set standards for personnel, public agency participation, terms of agreement between key participating agencies, policy, and evaluation.

DeVore, Joyce M., "A Descriptive-Evaluative Study of the Youth Service Bureau," San Diego, Calif. Master's thesis, San Diego State College, June 1970.

This thesis describes the organizational process and the program structure and content of a youth service bureau developed in response to State legislation stimulated by the President's Crime Commission Report. The thesis also provides evaluative conclusions and implications of this program.

Duxbury, Elaine. "Youth Service Bureaus, California Style," *Youth Authority Quarterly*, summer 1971, pp. 11–17.

A report on how the nine bureaus throughout California carried out the youth service bureau concept of reducing delinquency. It covers two pioneering years of the implementation of youth service bureaus.

Duxbury, Elaine. *Youth Service Bureaus, a First-Year Report to the California Legislature*. Department of the Youth Authority, January 1970.

This report discusses the development of bureaus and makes a preliminary evaluation.

Duxbury, Elaine. *Youth Service Bureaus in California: a Progress Report*. Number 2, California Youth Authority, January 1971.

The second-year report of youth service bureaus in California is a continuation of the previous year's report but discusses in more detail organization, delivering specific preventative services, coordination, program evaluation, plus descriptions of the nine bureaus.

Duxbury, Elaine. *Youth Service Bureaus in California: A Progress Report.* Number 3, California Youth Authority, January 1972.

The third-year report has a similar format to the first and second year reports but is more comprehensive. Definitions regarding terms such as coordination and diversion are discussed and in conclusion the author states, "The evidence shows that in some of the communities where the bureaus were located reductions in delinquency were rapid." p. 123.

Elson and Rosenheim. "Justice for the Child at the Grassroots," *American Bar Assn. Jour.* 51 (1965), p. 341.

An approach whereby lay citizens become involved as a hearing committee for young people in their neighborhood who have committed delinquent acts.

Empey, LaMar T. and Steven G. Lubeck, *Delinquency Prevention Strategies.* U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Services, Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration, 1970.

The authors describe a theoretical concept and suggest specific steps for making it operational. Global issues are raised and the authors indicate that not only is the definition of delinquency ambiguous but that the methods for dealing with it need reconsideration also.

Ferre, Sister Isolina, and Joseph P. Fitzpatrick. "Community Development and Delinquency Prevention: Puerto Rican and Mainland Models," paper presented at Amer. Soc. of Criminology, San Juan, P.R., Nov. 5, 1971, 11 pp.

This paper provides insight on the importance of considering culture and interpersonal relationships in implementing program.

Gemignani, Robert J., "Youth Service Systems," *Delinquency Prevention Reporter.* U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Social and Rehabilitation Services. Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration, July–August 1972.

This article illustrates that not only is delinquency processing questionable in terms of efficiency and positive results, it is expensive. The cost of processing in the juvenile justice system escalates with each cumulative step. A youth service system which serves to limit penetration into the criminal justice system has the potential for providing better service at less cost.

Gorlich, Elizabeth J. "Guidelines for Demonstration Projects for Youth Service Bureaus," U.S. Department of HEW, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Children's Bureau, 1969, 11 pp.

This booklet was prepared to stimulate interest in the concept of youth service bureaus and sets forth guides for the establishment of programs. It discusses auspices, structure, target group functions.

Great Britain, Home Dept. *The Child, The Family and The Young Offender.* Parliamentary publications, August 1965 Cmnd 2742 vol. 29 HMSO 1945, 14 pp.

This is the "British White Paper" which is the British version of the youth service bureau concept. It was a main source of reference in the development of the recommendation for youth service bureaus in the United States.

Handler, Joe F. and Margaret K. Rosenheim. "Privacy and Welfare: Public Assistance and Juvenile Justice," *Law and Contemporary Problems,* 31 (1966), pp. 377–412.

This article points out that it is clear that the overwhelming majority of delinquents taken into custody never see a juvenile court judge. Eighty percent of the adolescents taken into custody for delinquency probably never go to court. In essence, we operate with a system of prejudicial disposition.

Kahan, B. J. "The Child, the Family and the Youth Offender: Revolutionary or Evolutionary?" *6, Great Britain Journal of Criminology* (1966), 101–69.

This is one of a series of articles on the "British White Paper." The author points out that eventually we will have to solve problems of youth who make immature judgments by a means other than the full processes of the law.

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. *The Commission on Standards and Goals, Task Force on Corrections.* Chapter on diversion, currently in preparation. Washington, D.C., December 1972.

This publication contains a section on the development of youth service bureaus in the United States. It discusses the different methods of organization, structure, and program content with examples of specific programs. It recommends standards as to the purpose, decision structure, target group, functions, staffing, evaluation, and legislation relating to youth service bureaus.

Lemert, Edwin M. *Instead of Court: Diversion in Juvenile Justice,* National Institute of Mental Health, Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency, Public Health Service Pub. No. 2127, Chevy Chase, Md., 1971.

This 95 page monograph deals with the issue of diversion from the juvenile justice system. The problems and alternatives are analyzed systematically. Many of the activities of youth which are labeled as "delinquent" need to be normalized. Reform seems to depend on changes and legislation. Youth service bureaus are discussed briefly. In general, the author is critical of the initial lack of definition. He restrains himself from criticizing the bureaus too harshly and indicates that much depends on enabling legislation.

Lemert, Edwin M. "The Juvenile Court—Quest and Realities," *Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime,* Task Force on Juvenile Delinquency, The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Washington: GPO, 1967, pp. 91–107.

This is an overall view of the juvenile justice system, especially the juvenile court. A section on pages 96 and 97 entitled "Judicious Non-Intervention" is of particular interest as background to the youth service bureau concept.

Mangel, Charles, Sr. Ed. Look. "How to Make A Criminal Out of A Child," *Look,* June 29, 1971, pp. 49–53.

In a dramatic journalistic way, Mr. Mangel describes hardships of several boys who began their delinquent careers as a result of undesirable environment. In the article he talks to Milton Rector, and at the end there is a note that youth service bureau information can be obtained from National Council on Crime and Delinquency NCCD Center, Paramus, N.J. 07652.

Martin, John. "Toward a Political Definition of Juvenile Delinquency," U.S. Department of HEW, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration, Washington: GPO, 1970.

A critique of the juvenile justice system with the emphasis on the part that politics plays in the development of institutions. He seeks a system toward better checks and balances and suggests that we explore the way in which youth service bureaus might serve to reduce the imbalance of power between the juvenile justice system and those who receive its care.

Martin, John M., Charles F. Grosser, Dorothea Hubin and Joseph P. Fitzpatrick. "Theory Building in the Political Context of Community Action Programs." *Delinquency Prevention: The Convergence of Theory Building, Political Influence, and New Modes of Advocacy,* Institute for Social Research, Bronx, N.Y., Fordham University, October 1971, 71 pp.

The authors provide examples and field tests regarding the importance of political factions in developing and implementing youth service bureaus.

Moore, Eugene Arthur. "Youth Service Bureaus—Local Community Action Programs Prevents Delinquency," *The Journal of the American Judicature Society,* K, J 741, Judicature, vol. 52, No. 1, June–July 1968–69.

Judge Moore describes the community action-delinquency prevention program of Oakland County, Mich. He believes that to avoid a national disaster of delinquency, we need youth service bureau-type programs.

Norman, Sherwood. "The Youth Service Bureau, A Brief Description with Five Current Programs," National Council on Crime and Delinquency, New York, N.Y. 10010, NCCD, May 1970, 65 pp.

Description as to the purpose of a youth service bureau and an example of five model programs; i.e., Citizen Action, Community Organization, Cooperating Agency, Street Outreach and Systems Modification models.

Norman, Sherwood. *The Youth Service Bureau: A Key to Delinquency Prevention.* National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Paramus, N.J.: NCCD 1972.

On the establishment, administration, and operation of community youth service bureaus. Chapters include: rationale and function; how to start and fund a youth service bureau; organization; administration; linking youth to

service; developing resources; modifying systems; citizen organizations; evaluation; research-based planning.

Platt, Anthony M. "Saving and Controlling Delinquent Youth: A Critique," from *Issues in Criminology*, vol. V, No. 1, winter 1970, pp. 1–24.

The paper uses history and comparative perspective to evaluate recent happenings concerning the prevention and control of delinquency. It compares contemporary features of what it calls the delinquency control movement (DCM) with the child saving movement (CSM) which developed at the end of the 19th century.

Platt, Anthony M. "The Child Savers? The Invention of Delinquency," University of Chicago Press, 1969.

The author traces the efforts of social reformers of the late 19th century in the development and implementation of the Juvenile Court Act. For the most part, the scene of this study is Chicago. He points out that CSM brought about new categories of youthful misbehavior as law violations and, as a consequence, invented delinquency. The study attempts to find the social basis of humanitarian ideals and the intentions of CSM with institutions they helped to create.

Piliavin, Irving and Scott Briar, "Police Encounters with Juveniles," *American Journal of Sociology*, September 1964.

A study of police contacts with delinquents showed police exercise wide discretion in dealing with male juveniles. Most influential as to whether further action was taken upon contact was a boy's prior offense record, race, grooming and demeanor at the time of the encounter. Demeanor was the most significant criteria in regard to the action taken with first offenders.

Polk, Kenneth. "Delinquency and Community Action in Non-Metropolitan Areas," *Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime*. Task Force on Juvenile Delinquency, The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Washington: GPO, 1967, pp. 343–352.

This article deals with delinquency prevention in rural areas and smaller cities. The author points out that nonmetropolitan delinquency needs attention also.

Polk, Kenneth. "Delinquency Prevention and the Youth Service Bureau," *An Assessment of the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968*, by Daniel C. Jordan and Larry L. Dye, Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts 1970, pp. 87–117.

Possible functions of youth service bureaus are discussed. Five recommendations are: development of responsible and responsive communities; involvement of youth; development of nonlegal interrogative procedures; development of positive options for creation of legitimate identities; and individually oriented counseling services.

Reynolds, Paul Davidson and John J. Vincent. "Evaluation of Five Youth Service Bureaus in the Twin Cities Region," mimeographed paper for Minnesota Center for Sociological Research, Department of Sociology, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis (March 1972), 32 pp.

This progress report describes clientele and activities of youth service bureaus in the Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn. area. The research methodology used to obtain information was systematic and deliberate. After 6 months of study, the authors indicate that bureaus in the Twin Cities area are "providing the types of services envisioned by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice," p. 32.

Rosenheim, Margaret K., "Youth Service Bureaus: A Concept in Search of Definition," *Juvenile Court Judge's Journal*. Vol. XX, No. 2 (summer 1969), pp. 69–74.

Youth service bureaus have caused excitement because they were one of the few new suggestions in the President's Crime Commission Report. The stated purpose of bureaus is to avoid stigma, rely on change agencies rather than juvenile court and to energize community involvement. The author compares the strategy of a youth service bureau as extending the middle class ethic to less privileged areas in the community.

Rosenheim, M. K., and D. L. Skoler. "The Lawyer's Role at Intake and Detention Stages of Juvenile Court Proceedings," *Crime and Delinquency*, vol. II, No. 2 (April 1965), pp. 167–74.

Lawyers should have the right to be involved with juvenile court cases at any point in the proceedings and the earlier the better. From the practical side there is examination that if it is done in every case, it could perhaps become routine and not mean as much as it should.

Rubin, Ted. *Law as an Agent of Delinquency Prevention.* U.S. Department of HEW, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Washington: GPO, YDDPA 1971, 60 pp.

This paper was presented to the Delinquency Prevention Strategy Conference at Santa Barbara, Calif., Feb. 18–20, 1970 by Ted Rubin, a former judge of the juvenile court, city and county of Denver, Colo. There are actually several papers within the text; diversion and various techniques of diversion; legal attacks on the shortcomings of the juvenile justice system and education in the law.

Rutley, Ralph, "YSB Loves You," *Youth Authority Quarterly,* State of California, Department of the Youth Authority (summer 1971), pp. 18–20.

The author is a youth service bureau director and tells how a youth service bureau operates and how it "feels." He gives specific examples of programs and, in particular, relates the activities during the summer of 1971.

Saxe, John Godfrey. "The Blind Men and the Elephant," in Margery Gordon and Marie B. King, *A Magic World, An Anthology of Poetry.* New York, D. Appleton and Co. MCMXX (1930), pp. 104–5.

Six people describe what they "see" from different vantage points.

Schiering, G. David. "A Proposal for the More Effective Treatment of the 'Unruly' Child in Ohio: The Youth Service Bureau," reprint from University of Cincinnati Law Review, vol. 39, No. 2, (spring 1970), *Diverting Youth from the Correctional System,* U.S. Department of HEW, Washington: GPO, 1971, pp. 67–82.

The youth service bureau is presented as a means to preserve the philosophy of the juvenile court with the court itself balancing this by providing constitutional protections. He emphasizes purchasing services from other community agencies as a broker.

Scott, LeRoy. "Verbal Exchange—Active Counseling for Young People," *Youth Authority Quarterly.* State of California, Department of the Youth Authority, fall 1972, pp. 46–50.

Students from six junior and senior high schools participate on a voluntary basis in a group counseling program which places special emphasis on involving truant, predelinquent and delinquent youngsters. Group leaders are volunteers from State, city and county agencies and an important aspect of the program is the effect upon the agencies themselves.

Seymour, John A. "The Current Status of: Youth Service Bureaus," mimeographed for seminar with the Center for Study of Welfare Policy and Center for Studies in Criminal Justice, University of Chicago, Mar. 11, 1971, 25 pp.

This is a report on the seminar held Jan. 24–25, 1971, sponsored by the Center for the Study of Welfare Policy and the Center for Studies in Criminal Justice, University of Chicago. The seminar took in a wide range and was so diverse that it did not prove possible to achieve continuity. The author feels that seminar discussions were disappointing, partly because of the nature of the concept itself and because speakers rightly emphasized that no one model for a bureau could be devised. He felt it failed to bring the concept of diversion into sharp focus and confused specific diversion efforts with the overall description in a broad sense of delinquency prevention.

Seymour, John A. "Youth Service Bureaus" mimeographed paper prepared as background material for a seminar on youth service bureaus, sponsored by the Center for the Study of Welfare Policy and the Center for Studies in Criminal Justice, University of Chicago, Jan. 24–25, 1971, 38 pp.

The stated purpose of this paper is to examine the President's Crime Commission proposals for the establishment of youth service bureaus. The paper is well indexed with many references. It is a good academic analysis of the youth service bureau recommendation of the President's Crime Commission Report.

Sheridan, William. "Juvenile Court Intake," 2, *Journal of Family Law.* 139 pp. 65–67.

An analytical and comprehensive examination of the juvenile court intake process. The screening process is examined and would be one area that might be considered in the development of youth service bureaus.

Sheridan, William. "Juveniles Who Commit Non-criminal Acts: Why Treat in a Correctional System?" *Federal Probation* (March 1967), pp. 26–30.

Sheridan, William. "New Directions for the Juvenile Court," *Federal Probation* (June 1967), pp. 15–20.

Sheridan, William. "Structuring Services for Delinquency Children and Youth," *Federal Probation* (September 1967), pp. 51–55.

This series of three articles deals with the offender and potential offender from apprehension to discharge. The first has the most bearing on youth service bureaus. The description of intervening services between complainant and court is very similar in language to the Crime Commission Report. He describes a program which should receive referrals from a variety of sources, including police, courts, schools, public and private agencies, and parents.

Skoler, Daniel. "Future Trends in Juvenile and Adult Community-Based Corrections," *Juvenile Court Journal*, vol. XXI, No. 4 (winter 1971), pp. 98–103.

This is a survey type article which first relates the shortcomings of institutional programs and goes on to explore the community-based alternatives. First mentioned are youth service bureaus. He notes that we have no common agreement as to what a youth service bureau is, what services it should provide, or under whose auspices it should be operated.

Skoler and Tenney. "Attorney Representation in Juvenile Court," *4, Journal of Family Law*, 77 (1964), pp. 80–1.

The percentage of juvenile court offenders represented by attorneys in 1964 was not high nationwide. It predicts with a relative degree of accuracy the situation we have in 1971 of attorneys playing an increased role in juvenile court matters.

Sutermeister, Robert A, ed. *People and Productivity*. McGraw-Hill 2nd ed. 1969, 511 pp.

Technological development and raw material are important to productivity. So long as physical job conditions in terms of comfort and safety are reasonable they will not effect performance. The same can be said in regard to money and security. Egotistic needs require major attention today and in the future, as the educational level of our citizens is constantly increasing. The importance of participation is illustrated in that an individual or group may adopt for itself goals equal to or higher than those management would set.

Underwood, William A. "California Youth Service Bureaus," *Youth Authority Quarterly* (winter 1969), pp. 27–33.

Underwood, William A. "Youth Service Bureaus: A New Way for Offenders," *Youth Authority Quarterly* (fall 1968), pp. 12–3.

These articles trace the development of youth service Bureaus in California. Beginning with the National Crime Commission recommendation, enabling State legislation to establish four bureaus and the development of procedures that could be followed in order to implement the legislation and realize the concept of youth service bureaus.

U.S. Govermnent, President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society*. Washington: GPO, Feb. 1967, 340 pp.

This is the general report of the President's Crime Commission. It contains more that 200 recommendations and discussion of them in summary form. The main reference to youth service bureaus is on page 83.

U.S. Government, Task Force on Juvenile Delinquency. *The Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, Report on Juvenile Justice and Consultants Papers*. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Washington: GPO, 1967, 428 pp.

Overall this text makes inquiry and comments regarding youth crime and the juvenile justice system. Pages 9–22 deal with prejudicial dispositions and pages 19–21 treat in detail the recommendation for the establishment of youth service bureaus.

Vinter, Robert D., "Justice for the Juvenile: Myth or Reality?" Lecture presented at the University of Delaware under the auspices of E. Paul Dupont Endowment for the Study of Crime and Delinquency in Corrections, Newark, Del., Mar. 26, 1969.

The speaker illustrates that the criminal justice system, especially as it relates to delinquency, operates selectively in that we have all committed acts which, if detected could have resulted in adjudication and in some instances incarceration. He also comments on the juvenile court "As the marketplace wherein the community reputation and social identities of youth in trouble are transacted."

Wheeler, Stanton, Leonard S. Cottrell and Ann Romansco. "The Juvenile Court and Related methods of Delinquency Control," *Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime*, Task Force on Juvenile Delinquency, The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Washington: GPO, 1967, pp. 409–28.

The authors analyze current delinquency prevention programs. Of special significance to the youth service bureau are comments on page 417 about the potential harmful effects of the labeling process.

"White Paper Proposals, The," *6, British Journal of Criminology* (1966), 101–69.

This special journal article outlines the general principles and detailed proposals of the Government white paper. The advantages and criticisms of the proposals are reviewed overall. Several papers are presented with views from a psychiatrist, a lawyer, a criminologist, a legal reader, a probation officer and a children's officer.

Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration. "National Study of Youth Service Bureaus," [California Youth Authority, Robert L. Smith, William Underwood et al] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Social and Rehabilitation Service. Manuscript, November 1972.

This study makes a comprehensive assessment of youth service bureaus at the national level. It examines the youth service bureau's role in diversion and coordination and gives indication as to the number and location, auspices, objectives, services, staff, clientele, involvement of volunteers, organizational structure, and basis of finincial support. The study concludes that "Youth service bureaus in 1972 seem to be organizations pioneering transition—transition from bureaucratic-bound social institutions to a more flexible service system which recognizes that communities have differential needs and require special service delivery programs to resolve these needs."

Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration. "Youth Service Bureau Casebook," [California Youth Authority, Robert L. Smith, William Underwood et al] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Social and Rehabilitation Service. Manuscript, December 1972.

The 58 programs visited as a part of the national study of youth service bureaus in 1972 are described in terms of physical facilities, accessibility and appeal to clientele, relationships in the community, staff, objectives, program content and linkage to funding. The descriptions are in a narrative style and could be useful to those planning delinquency prevention programs.

Youth Study Committee. "An Inventory of Youth Services and Programs in Winston-Salem and Forsyth County," YSB of Wake Forest University, December 1970, 21 pp.

A report on 83 specific youth serving programs in Winston-Salem, N.C. area. The Youth Service Bureau of Wake Forest University provided leadership to make this paper possible.

Survey Respondents

Two-hundred and sixty-two possible youth service bureaus were identified by the national census conducted during the course of this Study. Of the 262, the following 222 respondents contributed information to the National Study.

Partners Program, 611 West Ninth Ave., Anchorage, Alaska 99510.

Totem Center, Box 1224, Juneau, Alaska 99801.

Nogales Youth Services Program, P.O. Box 2283, 225 Madison, Nogales, Ariz. 85621.

Maricopa County Youth Services Bureau, 1250 East Northern Ave., Phoenix, Ariz. 85020.

Youth Service Bureau, 646 South Sixth Ave., Phoenix, Ariz. 85003.

Scottsdale Youth Services, 6921 East Thomas Rd., Scottsdale, Ariz. 85251.

Barrio Youth Project, Inc., 1201 South First Ave., Phoenix, Ariz. 85003.

Whitney M. Young Youth Center, 1602 Buckey Rd., Phoenix, Ariz. 85036.

The Loretta Young Youth Project, P.O. Box 1271, Phoenix, Ariz.

Hatful of Peas. 2051 B, East Camelback, Phoenix, Ariz. 85016.

Valle del Sol Institute, 1209 South First Ave., Phoenix, Ariz. 85003.

Conway County Community Service, Inc., Youth Service Bureau, 510 North St. Joseph St., P.O. Box 679, Morrilton, Ark. 72110.

Clark County Youth Service Bureau, 404 Clay St., Arkadelphia, Ark. 71923.

Bell Garden Community Youth Service Bureau, 7100 Garfield Ave., Bell Gardens, Calif. 90201.

Yolo County Youth Service Bureau, 110 Sixth St., Broderick, Calif. 95605.

Duarte Self Help Center, 1434 East Huntington Dr., Duarte, Calif. 91010.

Escondido Youth Encounter, 829 South Escondido Blvd., Escondido, Calif. 92025.

C.D.C. Youth Crisis Center, Civic Center Drive & Walnut Ave., P.O. Box 1727, Fremont, Calif. 94538.

Multi-Service Approach to Del. Prev., 11611 Eldridge Ave., Lake View Terrace, Calif. 91342.

Bassett Youth Service Bureau, 915 North Orange Ave., La Puente, Calif. 91745.

Northeast Free Clinic, 4867 Eagle Rock Blvd., Los Angeles, Calif. 90041.

Pupil Services, Los Angeles City Schools, 450 North Grand Ave., Los Angeles, Calif. 90012.

Manteca House, 603 East Yosemite, Manteca, Calif.

Head Rest, Inc., 1707 Eye St., Modesto, Calif. 95351.

Project Open Future, 147 East Olive Ave., Monrovia, Calif. 91016.

Reach Out Narcotics & Drug Abuse Program, 315 South Ivy Ave., Monrovia, Calif. 91016.

Montclair Community Service Center, 10585 Central, Montclair, Calif. 91763.

Verbal Exchange Program, Oakland Public Schools, 1025 Second Ave., Oakland, Calif. 94606.

Drug Control Resource Center Project, 2303 Veatch St., Oroville, Calif. 95956.

Pacifica Youth Service Bureau, 160 Milagra Dr., Pacifica, Calif. 94044.

Community Youth Responsibility Program, 2220 University Ave., East Palo Alto, Calif. 93403.

Youth Community Resource Program, 1900 Pleasant Hill Rd., Pleasant Hill, Calif. 94523.

Richmond Youth Service Program, 1111 Nevin Ave., Richmond, Calif. 94801.

Youth Service Center of Riverside, Inc., 3847 Terracina Dr., Riverside, Calif. 92506.

San Diego Youth Service Bureau, 3650 Clairemont Dr., Suite 11, San Diego, Calif. 92117.

Youth Services Bureau of San Fernando Area, 111 Hagar Street, P.O. Box 902, San Fernando, Calif. 91341.

Chinatown Youth Service Center, 250 Columbus Ave., San Francisco, Calif. 94133.

Energy, Inc., 1811 34th Ave., San Francisco, Calif. 94122.

Neighborhood Youth Assistance Center, 1370 Wallace St., San Francisco, Calif. 94124.

Santa Clara County Youth Service Bureau, 1668 East Santa Clara St., San Jose, Calif. 95116.

Alternate Routes, P.O. Box 10260, Santa Ana, Calif. 92711.

Social Advocates for Youth, Inc., 218 "E" St., Santa Rosa, Calif. 95405.

Sonoma County Drug Abuse Council, 321 D Coddingtown Center, Santa Rosa, Calif. 95401.

In Site of Tuolumne County, Inc., 63 South Washington, P.O. Box 531, Sonora, Calif. 95370.

Awareness House, 701 West Bianchi, Stockton, Calif. 95207.

H.A.N.D.Y., Neighborhood Youth Association, 607 Sixth Ave., Venice, Calif. 90291.

Yuba-Sutter Youth Service Bureau, P.O. Box 563, Yuba City, Calif. 95991.

Special Services Center, 1002 North Wilmington Ave., Compton, Calif 90220.

R.A.P., 1000 Guerrero, San Francisco, Calif. 94110.

Western Addition Youth Defense Center, 1979 Sutter St., San Francisco, Calif. 94115.

Helpline Youth Counseling, P.O. 819, Cerrito, Calif. 90701.

Project DARE, 760 Westwood Plaza, Los Angeles, Calif. 90024.

Sunrise House, 310 Capitol St., Salinas. Calif. 93901.

Family Service Agency of Sacramento Area, 709 21st St., Sacramento, Calif 95814.

Glendale Outreach Program, 417 Arden Ave., Glendale, Calif. 91203.

Drop In Center, 112 East Walnut, Lompoc, Calif. 93454.

Welcome Home of Santa Paula, 722 East Main St., Santa Paula, Calif. 93060.

Project Aquarius, 425 Jackson St., Monterey, Calif. 93940.

Project Arriba, 2325 Seaman Ave., South El Monte, Calif. 91733.

Arvada Youth Action Commission, 7404 Grant Pl., Arvada, Colo. 80002.

Boulder Youth Service Bureau, 3450 North Broadway, Boulder, Colo. 80302.

Youth Coalition, 1660 Pearl St., Denver, Colo. 80203.

Denver Youth Service Bureau, 3006 Zuni St., Denver, Colo. 80211.

Glastonbury Youth Services Bureau, 2384 Main St., Glastonbury, Conn. 060633.

Hall Neighborhood House, Youth Service Bureau, 52 Green St., Bridgeport, Conn.

Office of Youth Opportunity Services, 1319 F St., NW., Washington, D.C.

Action for Children in Trouble, 122 C St., NW., Washington, D.C.

Lake County Youth Service Bureau, P.O. Drawer 387, 416 West Main St., Tavares, Fla. 32778.

Opportunity House, 735 Clemantis St., West Palm Beach, Fla. 33401.

Opportunity House, 810 Datura St., West Palm Beach, Fla. 33401.

McCoy Boys Base, P.O. Box 2226, McCoy AFB, Fla. 32812.

Opa Locka Halfway House, Sunland Training Center of Miami, Opa Locka, Fla. 33054.

Walter Scott Criswell House, Route 4, Box 623–A, Tallahassee, Fla. 32301.

Staff Development Center, 415 North Monroe St., Room 316, Tallahassee, Fla. 32303.

Hillsborough House, 2303 North Tampa St., Tampa, Fla. 33602.

Florida Division of Youth Services, 311 South Calhoun St., Tallahassee, Fla. 32304.

Kairos Halfway House, 1212 East Gonzalez St., Pensacola, Fla. 32501.

Palama Settlement, 810 North Vineyard, Honolulu, Hawaii 96817.

Youth Service Bureau of Boise, Inc., 807 West Franklin, Boise, Idaho 83702.

Youth Rehabilitation Division, 1226 F St., Lewiston, Idaho 83501.

"The Bridge" Youth Services Bureau, 434½ East NW., Highway, Palatine, Ill. 60067.

Youth Guidance Council, City Hall, 1528 Third Ave., Rock Island, Ill. 61201.

De Kalb Youth Services, 413 Franklin St., De Kalb, Ill. 60115.

St. Charles Youth Commission, 1432 South Seventh St., St. Charles, Ill. 60174.

Miami County Youth Services Bureau, Inc., 2½ South Broadway, Peru, Ind.

Howard County Youth Service Bureau, 200 North Union St., Kokomo, Ind. 46901.

Youth Advocacy, 509 West Washington, South Bend, Ind. 46601.

Posey County Circuit Court, Delinquency Prevention Courthouse, Mt. Vernon, Ind. 47620.

La Porte Youth Services Bureau, 214 Masonic Temple Bldg., La Porte, Ind. 46350.

Elkhart Youth Services Bureau, 403½ West High St., Elkhart, Ind. 40615.

Youth Services Bureau of Allen County, Inc., Room 202, 2211 South Calhoun St., Fort Wayne, Ind. 46804.

Gary Youth Services Bureau, 900 Madison St., Gary, Ind. 46402.

Youth Services Bureau, County Courthouse, Crawfordsville, Ind. 47933.

Greater Lafayette Youth Services Bureau, 1873-Y Shoshone Dr., Lafayette, Ind. 47905.

Cass County Youth Services Bureau, Room 411, Barnes Bldg., Logansport, Ind. 46947.

Hammond Youth Services Bureau, c/o School Board, Hohman Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46320.

White County Youth Services Bureau, 112 Court St., Monticello, Ind. 47960.

Bowling Green Youth Bureau, 730 Fairview Ave., Bowling Green, Ky. 42101.

Russell Youth Service Bureau, 1623 West Chestnut St., Louisville, Ky. 40203.

Youth Service Bureau, Brook St., Waterville, Maine 04901.

Youth Service Bureau, 30 Anthoine St., South Portland, Maine 04106.

Youth Aid Bureau, 142 Federal St., Portland, Maine 04101.

Augusta Juvenile Bureau, Augusta Police Department, City Hall, Augusta, Maine 04330.

Roving Youth Leaders, 717–60th Place N.E., Fairmount Heights, Md. 20027

Tri-County Youth Services Bureau, Box 101, Hughsville, Md. 20637.

Youth Services and Referral Bureau, Drug Abuse Prevention to Rehabilitation, 126 North St., Elkton, Md. 21921.

Bowie Involvement Program for Parents and Youth, City Hall, 13035 Ninth St., Bowie, Md. 20715.

Youth Awareness Inc., 5174 Brookway No. 3, Columbia, Md. 21043.

Caroline County Youth Services and Referral Bureau, P.O. Box 207, Courthouse, Denton, Md. 21629.

The Listening Post, 10300 Westlake Dr., Rockville, Md. 20034.

Juvenile Narcotics Prevention Program, Courthouse, Upper Marlboro, Md. 20870.

Bureau of Youth Services and Referral, 4500 Knox Rd., College Park, Md. 20740.

Queen Anne County Youth Center, Box 14, Centerville, Md. 21617.

Youth Services Department, City of Rockville, 111 South Perry St., Rockville Md. 20850.

East Baltimore Community Youth Services Center, 1425 North Potomac St., Baltimore, Md. 21213.

Youth Resources Bureau, 930 Massachusetts Ave., Cambridge, Mass. 02138.

Youth Resources Agency, Masonic Bldg., 558 Pleasant St., New Bedford, Mass. 02740.

Worcester Youth Resource Bureau, Room 230, 9 Walnut St., Worcester, Mass. 01608.

Youth Resources Bureau, 362 Belmont St., Brockton, Mass. 02401.

Model Cities—Street Academy, 2401 Washington St., Boston, Mass. 02119

Youth Resources Bureau, 188 Eastern Ave., Springfield, Mass. 01109.

Washtenaw Youth Services Bureau, 1819 South Wagner Rd., Ann Arbor, Mich. 48103.

The Foundation, 16600 Stephens, East Detroit, Mich. 48021.

Youth Contact Center, 56 East Fulton, Grand Rapids, Mich. 49502.

Oakland County Youth Assistance, 1200 North Telegraph Rd., Pontiac, Mich. 48053.

Youth Development Corp., 200 North Capitol, Davenport Bldg., Suite 703, Lansing, Mich. 48933.

Oak Park Department of Community Services, 13700 Oak Park Blvd., Oak Park, Mich. 48237.

Genesee County Youth Assistance Program No. 0238, Juvenile Division of Probate Court, County Office Bldg., Suite 103, 919 Beach St., Flint, Mich. 48502.

Youth Services Bureau, Highland Park, Department of Community Development, 399 Glendale, Highland Park, Mich. 48203.

Community Resocialization Center for Juveniles, 1501 Cedar, Grand Rapids, Mich.

Relate, Inc., Box 89, Wayzata, Minn. 55391.

Phalen Area Community Council Youth Service Bureau, 982 Forest, St. Paul, Minn. 55106.

Give and Take Health Center, 5708 West 36th St., St. Louis Park, Minn. 55416.

White Bear Lake Area Youth Resource Bureau, 615 Fourth St., White Bear Lake, Minn. 55110.

Youth Service Bureau, 301 M City Hall, Minneapolis, Minn. 55415.

Minnesota Metropolitan Youth Advocacy Corps, 550 Capitol Square Bldg., St. Paul, Minn. 55101.

Youth Crisis Center, Inc., 1119 North West St., Jackson, Miss. 39202.

TCCC Juvenile Deliquency Prevention, 323 Rose St., Jackson, Miss. 39203.

The Miracle House, c/o Jackson Hinds County Youth Court, 400 East Silas Brown St., Jackson, Miss. 39201.

A Predelinquent Intercept Program For A Large Metropolitan Community, 600 East 22nd St., Kansas City, Mo. 64108.

Youth Development Service, 820 North 31st St., Billings, Mont. 59101.

YD/DP—Rural America Project, 805 North Last Chance Gulch, Helena, Mont. 59601.

Family Services—Youth Services, Box 788, Kalispell, Mont. 59901.

YMCA Youth Service Bureau, 139 North 11th St., Lincoln, Nebr. 68508.

Contemporary Social Concerns Program, Omaha Y.M.C.A., 430 South 20th St., Omaha, Nebr. 68102.

Office of Youth Services, 908 Elm St., Manchester, N.H. 03101.

Youth Services Bureau, Middleton Township, Town Hall, Middletown, N.J. 07748.

Camden Community Treatment Center, 1488 Haddon Ave., Camden, N.J. 08103.

Pupil Personnel Services, Passaic Public Schools, 220 Passaic St., Passaic, N.J. 07055.

Municipal Youth Guidance Councils, Department of Community Affairs, 363 West Satae St., Trenton, N.J. 08625.

Men Aiding Youth By Experience, Municipal Plaza, West Orange, N.J. 07052.

Council for Youth, Inc., P.O. Box 454, Las Cruces, N. Mex. 88001.

Drop-Inn, 110 South Avenue F, Portales, N. Mex. 88130.

Neighborhood Youth Diversion Program, 1933 Washington Ave., Bronx, N.Y. 10457.

Wiltwyck Brooklyn Center, 260 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y. 10010.

Buffalo Youth Board, 218 City Hall, Buffalo, N.Y. 14202.

Yonkers Youth Services Agency, 138 South Broadway, Yonkers, N.Y. 10701.

Erie County Youth Board, Room 318–B, County Hall, Buffalo, N.Y. 14202.

Cheektowaga Youth Board, Broadway and Union Rds., Cheektowaga, N.Y. 14227.

Cohoes Youth Bureau, 22–40 Remson St., Cohoes, N.Y. 12047.

Youth and Recreation Commission, 25 Court St., Cortland, N.Y. 13045.

Dunkirk Youth Bureau, City Hall, Dunkirk, N.Y. 14048.

Suffolk County Youth Board, Veteran's Memorial Highway, Hauppauge, N.Y. 11787.

Ithaca Youth Bureau, 1701 North Cayuga St., Ithaca, N.Y. 14850.

Lockport Youth Bureau, 67 Main St., Lockport, N.Y. 14094.

Long Beach Youth Board, City Hall, Long Beach, N.Y. 11561.

Nassau County Youth Board, 33 Willis Ave., Mineola, N.Y. 11501.

Niagara Falls Youth Bureau, 734 Seventh St., Niagara Falls, N.Y. 14302.

Dutchess County Youth Board, 28 Market St., Poughkeepsie, N.Y. 12601.

Town of Greece Bureau, 4614 Dewey Ave., Rochester, N.Y. 14612.

Town of Oyster Bay Youth Bureau, 7800 Jericho Turnpike, Syosset, N.Y. 11791.

Tonawanda Youth Board, 200 Niagara St., Tonawanda, N.Y. 14150.

West Seneca Youth Bureau, 144 Sharon Dr., West Seneca, N.Y. 14224.

City of Oneida Youth Bureau, 268 North Main St. (Box 441), Oneida, N.Y. 13421.

Hudson Youth Bureau, City Hall, 520 Warren St., Hudson, N.Y. 12524.

Oswego County Youth Bureau, 45 Bronson St., Oswego, N.Y. 13126.

Rochester-Monroe County Youth Board, 111 Westfall Rd., Rochester, N.Y. 14620.

City-County Youth Board, 300 South Geddes St., Syracuse, N.Y. 13204.

Youth Service Bureau, 255 Main St., White Plains, N.Y. 10601.

Youth Services Bureau of Greensboro, Inc., 1211 West Market St., Greensboro, N.C. 27402.

Youth Services Bureau of Wake Forest University, 110 North Hawthorne Rd., Winston-Salem, N.C. 27104.

Juvenile Court Counselors, P.O. Box 1341, Henderson, N.C. 27536.

Lee County Youth Development Commission, Box 972, Sanford, N.C. 27330.

Youth Services Center, Swannanoa, N.C. 28778.

Youth Services Center, P.O. Box 1907, Highway 301 South, Rocky Mount, N.C. 27801.

Juvenile Detention, P.O. Box 1051, Lumberton, N.C. 26358.

Juvenile Counselor, P.O. Box 64, Tarboro, N.C. 27886.

Lower Cape Fear Juvenile Services Center, P.O. Box 2814, Castle Hayne, N.C. 28429.

Western Piedmont Council of Governments, P.O. Box 807, Hickory, N.C. 28601.

Youth Service Bureau, 1313 East Broad St., Columbus, Ohio 43205.

Youth Services Bureau, 514 Wooster Ave., Akron, Ohio 44307.

Youth Services Unit of Center for Human Services, 1005 Huron Rd., Cleveland, Ohio 44115.

The Youth Service Bureau, 1332 Belb Ave., Toledo, Ohio 43607.

Youth Services of Tulsa, Inc., 222 East Fifth St., Tulsa, Okla. 74120.

Counterpoint—Youth Service Bureau, 9702 SE., Foster Rd., Portland, Oreg. 97266.

Northumberland County Youth Service Bureau, 520 Rock St., Shamokin, Pa. 17872.

Director of Special Services, Lycoming County Court House, Williamsport, Pa. 17701.

Centre County Youth Service Bureau, 205 East Beaver Ave., State College, Pa. 16801.

Intensive Area Youth Worker Program, Youth Conservation Services, Department of Public Welfare, Room 814, City Hall Annex, Philadelphia, Pa. 19107.

Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, Health and Welfare Bldg., Seventh and Foster Sts., Harrisburg, Pa. 17120.

Ponce Youth Service Bureau, Dispensario San Antonio, Inc., Avenida Padre Noell No. 30, Apartado 213, Playa, Ponce, P.R. 00731.

Rhode Island Youth Service Bureau, 231 Amherst St., Providence, R.I. 02909.

Youth Services Bureau of El Paso, 118 South Campbell, El Paso, Tex. 79901.

Youth Services Bureau of Tarrant County, 1622 Rogers Rd., Fort Worth, Tex. 76107.

Youth Services and Resource Bureau, Inc., 501 Trust Bldg., San Angelo, Tex. 76901.

Youth Services Project, P.O. Box 9066, San Antonio, Tex. 78204.

Central Texas Youth Service Bureau, 112½ East Central, Belton, Tex. 76513.

Youth Services and Resource Bureau, Matagora County, P.O. Box 1728, Bay City, Tex. 77414.

Youth Services Division, 1200 Clifton, Waco, Tex. 76704.

Eagle Pass Youth Services Bureau, 614 Quarry St., Eagle Pass, Tex. 78852.

Mobile Youth Services Bureau of the Y.W.C.A., 621 Moody, Galveston, Tex. 77550.

Community Adjustment Services Treatment Bureau, 1015 East Princess Anne Rd., Norfolk, Va. 23504.

React, 809 East Marshall St., Richmond, Va. 23221.

Insular Training School, Anna's Hope, Christiansted, St. Croix, V.I. 00820.

Youth Activities Coordination, P.O. Box 599, St. Thomas, V.I. 00801.

Virgin Islands Commission on Youth, P.O. Box 539, St. Thomas, V.I. 00801.

Youth Care Center, P.O. Box 539, St. Thomas, V.I. 00801.

Seattle-King County Center for Youth Services, Ste. 300, 2208 Northwest Market St., Seattle, Wash. 98107.

Bremerton Center for Youth Services, 3421 Sixth St., Bremerton, Wash. 98310.

Tri-City Center for Youth Services, 207–E North Dennis, Kennewick, Wash. 99336.

Twin City Center for Youth Services, 712 Vine St., Chehalis, Wash. 98532.

Delinquency Prevention and Control, 115 South Chelan, Wenatchee, Wash. 98801.

Yakima Center for Youth Services, 1003 Larson Bldg., Yakima, Wash. 98902.

Shack Neighborhood House, P.O. Box 84, Pursglove, W. Va.

Dane County Social Planning Agency, 621 North Sherman Ave., Madison, Wis. 53704.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1973 O—495-075